REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are present for examination.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Yonemitsu (5,485,279) in view of Matsushima (5,453,788). In applying the primary reference, the Examiner has indicated that applicant's step of selecting of one of two fields that form the frame is performed by Yonemitsu as element 52 shown in Yonemitsu Fig. 9A. This analysis by the Examiner, however, is incorrect as explained below.

In the method of the present invention the interlaced encoded image data has a two-field structure, and one of the two fields which constitute one frame is decoded so as to obtain data for one frame from data for one field.

The Examiner argues that the Yonemitsu reference discloses a circuit which selects one of two fields in the element 52 in Fig. 9A of Yonemitsu. However, this circuit of Yonemitsu selects a mode of decoding from either the frame encoding mode or the field prediction mode. In other words, the data is decoded by either a field construction or a frame construction. This function of the circuit in Yonemitsu differs from the process for selecting one of two fields as done in the present invention. According to the above differences between the process of the present invention and the function of the circuit of Yonemitsu, Yonemitsu does not teach performing the effect of the present invention in which it is possible to display a frame image with high quality, like a frame image which is constructed by the entire data for one frame, by decoding the data of one field.

More specifically, in the first embodiment of applicant's invention, the field selector 23 selects one of odd and even fields forming each picture frame. However, no such corresponding element to the above field selector is disclosed in Yonemitsu.

In order to emphasize applicant's invention, applicant has added the word "only" to each of claims 1 and 3 so that it is clear that only of the two fields in any given frame is selected. It is believed that the Examiner has already interpreted and applied applicant's claim with this same meaning so that adding the word "only" does not raise any new issues that were not already previously considered by the Examiner.

In view of the arguments set forth above, it is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The application is now believed to be in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date July 17, 2003

By _____ 36,257

FOR David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257

FOLEY & LARDNER
Customer Number: 22428
22428
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399